

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 22-26, 28-30, 33-40, 44 and 46-54 were allowed and claims 15-17 were "objected to"

Claims 41-43 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 15 and 32 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claim 32 can be found at page 16, lines 10-20 of the specification, for example.

Claims 1-3, 6-26, 28-40, 44 and 46-54 are currently pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because: the amendments of claims 15 and 32 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in §714.12 that "[a]ny amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." (Underlining added for emphasis) Moreover, §714.13 sets forth that "[t]he Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

I. OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 15-17:

Claim 15 has been rewritten into independent form to be in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to claims 15-17 is overcome.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

As previously mentioned above, claims 41-43 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the rejection of claims 41-43 is now moot.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 10-12, 19-21, 31, 32, 42 AND 43 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(e) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY MATSUDA (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,718,333):

Matsuda fails to disclose "a document relation judgment method **for judging a relation between documents in a network** via an apparatus connected with the network, the method comprising: **extracting a link relation from a first document**; extracting a predetermined character string which links a second document in the first document, from the first document; and **judging whether the second document is a non-text document related to contents of the first document**" as recited by claim 10, for example. Claim 31 recites features somewhat similar to those of claim 10. Specifically, Matsuda fails to discuss "judging a relation between documents in a network...judging whether the second document is a non-text document related to contents of the first document," as recited in claim 10.

In contrast, Matsuda discloses structured document classification device for classifying structured documents by types, for example, a patent document, a study, a specification, or a product catalog (see column 1, lines 44-45 and column 2, lines 4-6 and FIG. 3, for example). The device includes a structural feature extracting section for extracting a structural feature or an incidental feature from each structured document, a structural feature rule base for storing a rule dedicated to the extracted structural feature or incidental feature; and a verifier for verifying each feature which is extracted according to the rule and calculating scores for relevance to each type of document (see column 5, lines 50-62, for example).

Matsuda also discloses a structured document classification device which includes an input/output device for **inputting a search parameter and a type of a target structured document** and for outputting search results (see column 2, lines 45-49).

Matsuda further includes a type index 210 for storing the types of the HTML documents generated from a document classifier 100 (see FIG. 1, for example). The document classifier extracts one HTML document at a time from the document database which stores the document data and inputs the HTML documents into the structural feature extracting section. The structural feature extracting section starts the keyword feature extractor and extracts a tag and keyword pair from the HTML document, and sends them to the verifier. **The structure feature rule base 130 stores a rule which defines conditions and scores for each type of**

document and the verifier verifies the features according to the rules and adds corresponding scores described by the rule and obtains the relevance to each type of document and stores the results in the type index 210 (see column 4, lines 17-46, for example).

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that column 11, lines 42-46 and column 12, lines 32-52 of Matsuda discloses “judging whether the second document is a non-text document related to contents of the first document,” as recited in claim 10, for example. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. In contrast, the cited portions merely discuss inputting an HTML document into the structural feature extracting section, the keyword feature extractor, the image feature extractor, the link feature extractor, the tag structural feature extractor and extracting the various information from the HTML document and sending it to the verifier to be verified and scored based upon the rule which defines the conditions and scores for each type of document (see column 11, lines 42-46). Matsuda does not disclose judging whether another document is a non-text document related to the contents of the HTML document. That is, Matsuda merely discloses judging the HTML document itself and sorting and scoring the HTML document based upon the type of document and the document’s relevance to the type (i.e., product catalog, etc.). **This is not comparable to determining whether the contents of that HTML document is related to the contents of another HTML document.** The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner appears to be associating “relevance to the type of document” with “whether the second document is a non-text document related to contents of the first document,” as recited in claim 10, for example. Further, at column 12, lines 32-52, also cited by the Examiner, Matsuda merely discusses extracting upper level documents (HTML documents linked to the target HTML document) and lower level documents (i.e., HTML documents with which the target HTML document is linked) and sends the information to the verifier which merely verifies the features and adds a score and obtains a relevance of the document to each type of document.

Regarding claim 32, at page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that column 8, lines 36-40 of Matsuda disclose “judging the type of service provided by the document” as recited in claim 32. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Again, determining a type of document as discussed in Matsuda, for example, product catalog, patent, specification, etc. is not comparable to judging the type of service provided by the document.

Based upon the above comments, the present invention as recited in claims 10, 31 and 32, for example, patentably distinguishes over Matsuda.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 13 AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER MATSUDA IN VIEW OF MUKAI (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,446,095):

Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 10. Therefore, the comments mentioned above in section III may be applied here also. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Further, the Applicant traverses the Examiner's assertion of obviousness mentioned at page 7.

V. REJECTION OF CLAIM 18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER MATSUDA IN VIEW OF PAGE (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,285,999):

Claim 18 depends from claim 10. Therefore, the comments mentioned above in section III may be applied here also. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Again, as mentioned above, the Applicant traverses the Examiner's assertion of obviousness mentioned at page 9.

V. CONCLUSION:

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

2/27/2007

By:


Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501